

Proposed Online Supplement to
“Violence, Older Peers, and the Socialization of Adolescent Boys in Disadvantaged
Neighborhoods”

(Supplement word count: 4,957)

This supplement provides further information on the fieldwork methodology as well as the analysis of NELS data presented in the main text.

Fieldwork

The fieldwork includes in-depth, unstructured interviews with 60 adolescent boys ages 13 to 18 living in three predominantly African-American areas of Boston, with 20 boys per area. The areas were selected to allow for explicit comparisons between similar youth who live in neighborhoods that vary on a key structural characteristic: the poverty rate. Two of the areas (“Roxbury Crossing” and “Franklin”) have high rates of family poverty (between 35 and 40 percent in the 2000 census). The third area (“Lower Mills”) has a low poverty rate (below ten percent). Each area consists of two contiguous census tracts. Selected characteristics from the 2000 census are provided in Table S1. Franklin and Roxbury Crossing have many of the social and economic characteristics associated with high poverty neighborhoods, including lower proportions of workers in professional or managerial occupations, fewer affluent families, greater receipt of public assistance, lower levels of education, more female-headed families, and greater unemployment. In contrast, Lower Mills exhibits the characteristics of relatively more advantaged areas, such as more owner-occupied housing, low unemployment, higher levels of education,

less receipt of public assistance, and more affluent families. As I have defined them, Roxbury Crossing, Franklin, and Lower Mills are geographic areas of the city rather than social neighborhoods. Each area encompasses multiple locales that more closely approximate neighborhoods that residents recognize as such. Yet the neighborhoods within each area share broadly parallel histories, demographic and structural characteristics, and relations to the larger Boston metropolitan region.

The interviews investigated how the subjects think about their neighborhoods as geographic and social spaces and how that overlaps with their social networks, daily travel, and contact with institutions. Though a full discussion of these results is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to note that when the boys and their parents describe their neighborhoods, they are referring to much smaller spaces, often only a few blocks in any direction. The boundaries of these more limited spaces are to some degree reinforced by the geographic patterning of violence described in the main text. The terms Roxbury Crossing, Franklin, and Lower Mills serve as shorthand to delineate the three comparison study areas and to provide anonymity for the research subjects by broadening the geographic scope of reference. Hereafter, the term “neighborhood” will refer to the geographic and social spaces defined by the subjects, and the term “area” will be used to distinguish the three larger study areas. As in previous research (e.g. Furstenberg et al 1999, Furstenberg and Hughes 1997), there was great variation in subjects’ conceptions of their neighborhoods (even among neighbors) and the degree to which their neighborhoods overlapped with their social networks. For this reason, and because long-form census data are not generally available at such small levels of aggregation, I do not attempt to report characteristics for subject-defined neighborhoods.

The adolescent male interview subjects were Black, Latino, or of mixed race, with Latinos being primarily of Puerto Rican or Dominican descent. Each boy was interviewed multiple times, with at least two and sometimes as many as four sessions per subject. Multiple interview sessions were required to cover all the material in detail, but they also provided the benefit of repeated interactions between the interviewer and subject, which can serve to build trust and rapport (Eder and Fingerson 2003). For 80 percent of the subjects, a single interview was also conducted with a family member, almost always the mother, to understand a caretaker's perspective on the neighborhood and on the young man's experiences. The adult interviews also provided a check on the accounts and experiences offered by the adolescent boys. Each interview session lasted from 60 to 90 minutes. Most interviews took place in the subjects' homes, but interviews were also conducted in community centers and occasionally in a park or coffee shop. Each youth or parent was paid \$20 per interview session. The interviews with the boys and their family members were conducted in two stages. Fourteen pilot subjects were first interviewed in September, October, or November 2003. The remainder of the interviews were conducted between May and August 2004. Subjects were promised individual anonymity but were informed that the general locations of their neighborhoods would be disclosed. All names used in this paper are pseudonyms. Table S2 displays demographic characteristics for each adolescent male subject.

In summer 2003, prior to the pilot interviews, I interviewed 50 community leaders, ministers, youth workers, social workers, and school officials who were knowledgeable about particular neighborhoods or about youth in the city in general. These "neighborhood informant" interviews provided background information on the

fieldwork neighborhoods, youth issues in Boston, and entrée into the fieldwork neighborhoods. Many neighborhood informants assisted with contacting boys and their parents. The neighborhood informants also provided an additional check on the boys' accounts and descriptions of their neighborhoods. Two research assistants and the author conducted a total of 233 interview sessions (188 or 81% of which were conducted by the author). During the fieldwork period, I also attended weekly community meetings and other events in which youth issues, particularly youth violence, were discussed by community members, police, ministers, social workers, street workers, and the youth themselves. These meetings provided important background and context for preparing for and understanding the interviews with individual youth.

The youth interviews centered on three general topics, only some of which are considered in this paper. First is the relationship between the young man's geographic neighborhood and "social" neighborhood, including peer networks, use of neighborhood and non-neighborhood institutions and organizations, time use, and local and extended family. Second is the young man's experience with school and work, including plans for the future. Third is the young man's experience with girls, romantic and sexual relationships, contraception, and fatherhood, including plans for the future and views toward marriage and childrearing.

For 48 (80%) of the adolescent boys, a family member who was one of the boys' primary caretakers was also interviewed. These family members included 39 mothers, four fathers, three grandmothers, one stepmother, and one adult brother. The family member interview included a brief life history, a discussion of the neighborhood, a discussion of parenting attitudes and strategies, and a discussion of the subject's views of

the boy's educational, work, and relationship experiences as well as prospects for the future in those areas. The goals of the family member interview were: (1) securing an alternative, adult account of the boys' experiences, (2) securing an alternative, adult account of the social and cultural neighborhood environment, and (3) understanding parenting practices, particularly though not exclusively as they related to neighborhood context.

With a qualitative research design and a small sample size, representativeness of recruited subjects is not possible. Rather, the goal was to interview a broad cross section of boys in each neighborhood, rather than just those adolescents most visible on the street who are often the focus of research on youth in disadvantaged neighborhoods. In particular, a key goal was to interview boys from various family socioeconomic backgrounds in each study area to allow for cross-neighborhood contrasts of comparable adolescent boys. In other words, efforts were made to recruit boys from more disadvantaged family backgrounds in the low-poverty area (Lower Mills) and boys from more advantaged family backgrounds in the high poverty areas (Franklin and Roxbury Crossing). While the final sample was by no means balanced across study areas in terms of family socioeconomic background, there was enough diversity within each area to allow for reasonable cross-neighborhood comparisons.

The ability to make comparisons across neighborhoods is a key aspect of this study's research design. Due to small sample sizes, qualitative data are ill-suited to establishing the absence of anything. However, by asking similar questions and discussing the same topics with individuals in different types of neighborhoods, key differences in the daily lives of adolescent boys in those neighborhoods can be revealed.

It was only through these explicit comparisons that differences across neighborhoods were revealed in boys' experiences of violence and threat of victimization, in the role of older males in social networks, and in expectations of gender distrust.

I used a variety of procedures to recruit the youth and parent research subjects. First, subjects were recruited through the social networks of the neighborhood informants. Since this was a diverse group, ranging from ministers to street workers to ex-convicts, the young people recruited in this way were also a diverse group. Second, I posted flyers around the neighborhoods, which also generated a diverse set of subjects. It was primarily parents and other guardians who responded to these flyers, but they varied considerably. On one extreme were parents who regularly grabbed any opportunity for their son and saw the chance to talk to a university researcher as yet another potentially positive experience. On the other extreme were parents who were at the end of their wits in controlling their sons' behavior and were hoping the interview experience would serve as a positive shock. Flyers also served to recruit youth who were not embedded in neighborhood-based social networks. Third, a few youth were recruited via meetings on the street. Finally, I recruited 14 subjects through snowball sampling, recruiting the friends of other subjects. Neighborhood informants were recruited for participation through letters to heads of key institutions and organizations and at community meetings and events.

Within the domain of qualitative studies of neighborhoods, there are multiple possible research methodologies, each with its own strengths and weaknesses. Qualitative neighborhood studies are typically single-neighborhood ethnographies (recent examples include Patillo-McCoy 1998, Small 2004, Kefalas 2003). However, I chose to pursue in-

depth unstructured interviews rather than ethnography, focus groups, or other methodologies. First, interviews allow for an efficient research design when the research question is already theoretically well-defined, when comparison across neighborhoods is necessary, when diversity of individuals within neighborhoods is required, and when only certain content domains are included within the scope of the project. Interview topics and subject recruitment can be tailored to specific research goals. Second, interviews provide subjects the opportunity to reflect on and discuss their experiences and views privately, which is particularly important when what subjects think is a key part of the study (Young 2004). Particularly with issues like sexual behavior and romantic relationships, adolescents tend to discuss them in joking or playful terms when doing so in a group, so interview-based studies are common when these topics are involved (Eder and Fingerson 2003). Interviews remove the need for subjects to perform for peers or others with whom they will have future interactions or with whom they need be concerned about the repercussions of their statements. This, of course, is a weakness as well as a strength. As Goffman (1959) has argued, all social interaction is to some degree performance, and research interviews are no exception. Subjects may also perform for the researcher, particularly when the researcher is not a fixture in the natural setting of the subject's daily life and therefore is less able to check the veracity of subjects' statements. Gathering data from multiple sources – boys, parents, neighborhood informants – as I have done here, can provide only a partial check. Using friendship networks to recruit subjects, as was done for some of the subjects in this study, provides another source of information, as friends were asked to describe one another and their interactions and activities together.

Yet even when boys tell somewhat exaggerated stories of their experiences or act to impress an outside interviewer, the way they construct their narratives – the identification of key actors, the categories they use to describe individuals, groups, or events, and the cause and effect interpretations they attach to events – reveal as much about their understandings of their social worlds as the “facts” of their stories. Given that a primary goal of this research is to comprehend how the subjects interpret and understand their social interactions, neighborhood contexts, and prospects for the future, how the subjects construct and relate their narratives are as important as the details of the actual events. That said, however, aside from the hyperbole that is regularly a part of adolescent male discourse, I uncovered only a few outright falsehoods and report only results based on consistent patterns across multiple subjects.

Interviewing the youngest boys, those ages 13 and 14, proved to be one of the main challenges in this research. It should come as no surprise that young adolescent boys vary widely in their ability and willingness to articulate their thoughts. In addition, their lack of experiences with some topics of conversation, such as sexual and romantic relationships, made it difficult for them to elaborate their opinions and views with concrete examples. There was considerable variation, however, in the degree to which this was an issue, and it was not a concern at all for most of the boys. The challenge was selecting specific topics around which to have a conversation without leading the boys too much by introducing issues that they did not regularly think about already. In order to keep the discussions concrete and grounded, the interviews focused on the boys own experiences and their understandings of those experiences.

When it became necessary to abstract away from the subjects' own daily experiences to understand their expectations for the future or their strategies for dealing with potential problems, interview techniques were used that would at least allow the conversation to be grounded in concrete ideas. For example, one technique was using vignettes to allow for discussion of a particular situation, dilemma, or decision. The vignettes were paragraph-long stories about different problems or decisions that adolescent boys might confront. They included (1) fights between groups of boys, (2) competing priorities for school effort, particularly girlfriends, (3) choosing which school to go to, (4) being judged by one's clothing and appearance, (5) a girlfriend who does not want to have sex, (6) deciding what to do after a girlfriend becomes pregnant, (7) resolving a conflict between mother and girlfriend, and (8) deciding whether to marry the mother of one's baby. Each vignette was presented and then followed by a set of debriefing questions designed to illicit the subject's opinions about how to react to the situation and what the consequences of various reactions would be. These questions also included a variety of additional details or contingencies for the vignette to probe the range of responses. An initial set of vignettes was constructed and then revised after testing during the pilot interviews. The challenge in constructing the vignettes was to create a story that presented the subject with a difficult decision (one in which social desirability did not immediately suggest a particular response) and that led to variation in responses across subjects. Swidler (2001) contains another example of vignettes.

Another challenge of the interviews was the "social distance" between the interviewer and the subjects. The author (a white male from a middle class background in his late twenties at the time of the interviews) conducted the vast majority of the

interviews. A number of techniques were used to bridge the social distance between interviewer and subject. First, because I spent a year living and working in inner-city Boston as a community organizer and was already at least somewhat familiar with the study neighborhoods, I could subtly signal my “insider” knowledge of the places and institutions (and sometimes people) discussed in the interviews. For example, asking whether the basketball hoop had been fixed yet in the local park favored by the subject or noting some new store in a commercial strip could indicate a more long-term presence in the community and establish common reference points for the discussion. Second, the interviews always started with the least invasive topics, beginning with sports, movies, music, and video games, progressing to neighborhood, friends and family, school, and finally romantic and sexual relationships and fatherhood. This allowed rapport and trust to build over time during the interview and across interview sessions before more sensitive topics were discussed. Very quickly in the first interview, almost all subjects became enthusiastic about participation and required little extra pushing to articulate their ideas (and sometimes offered even more detail than was really necessary, particularly on romantic and sexual behavior). No subject refused to participate in a second or third interview after experiencing the initial interview.

Third, the interviews were framed for the subjects as being their chance to play the “expert” on the local neighborhood and to tell the interviewer about what living in the neighborhood is really like. Most subjects seemed to enjoy being the expert on their neighborhoods and their experiences in the context of the interview. This framing quickly upended their expectations about the interviewer based on prior experiences, and reduced the power dynamics that are particularly at play in interviews with youth (Eder and

Fingerson 2003). Most of their prior interactions with adult men, particular white men, were in institutional settings such as schools, health care settings, or criminal justice institutions where the subjects had little or no power or authority and were not allowed to express their opinions or views. Once it became clear that the purpose of the interview was to allow them to tell their stories from their perspectives, they became engaged.

Fourth, the outsider status, while certainly a disadvantage in some of the ways discussed above, can also be an advantage. Because an outside interviewer is removed from the subjects' social networks, there are fewer ramifications to information disclosure in the interview setting. There is little chance that information, attitudes, or displays of emotion or distress conveyed in the interview will reach others in a subject's social network. Subjects displayed many behaviors in the interviews that might lead to "loss of face" on the street, including the pain of feeling abandoned by their own fathers, their desires to separate from their neighborhood peer group out of fear for physical safety, or their desire to eventually marry their girlfriends.

Fifth, as a partial check on the importance of social distance between interviewer and subject, two African-American male students (one a graduate student and one an advanced undergraduate) also conducted the interviews with some of the subjects. Both of these interviewers had either prior personal or professional experience with the subject population. The analysis detected no differences between interviewers in the boys' willingness to share their experiences and views or in the types of experiences or views they recounted.

Finally, given Boston's history of racial strife, it is important to understand how race did – and did not – play a role in the fieldwork. Race and ethnicity was far more

salient in the parent interviews than in the interviews with the adolescent boys. Black parents discussed, and lamented, racial changes in the neighborhood as Latinos moved into Boston's public housing, and Latino parents often blamed blacks for violence and other neighborhood problems. Some black parents also expressed considerable distrust of whites – particularly the working class whites associated with South Boston and past conflicts over busing – and white-controlled institutions such as city hall and the police. Yet, as has been reported elsewhere (e.g. Carter 2005), race was far less salient to adolescents. Many reported having friends of other racial or ethnic groups, and because large-scale Latino immigration is relatively new in Boston, there is less history of conflict between black and Latino gangs than in other cities such as Chicago or Los Angeles (Sullivan 1989 also reports little inter-ethnic gang conflict in the three New York neighborhoods he studied). Boston is a relatively small city, and racial isolation is less severe. In contrast to what one might expect from neighborhoods on the South Side of Chicago, for example, most residents of the study areas regularly see whites in their neighborhoods and interact with whites in stores, schools, or other institutional settings. Other than the “social distance” issues discussed above, I experienced no racial hostility. This may have been in part due to my affiliation with Harvard University, which clearly distinguished me from the white working class of South Boston and which has a positive reputation in many of Boston's poor communities as a result of the community service projects (summer camps, after-school programs, mentoring programs) that Harvard undergraduates run with university and community support.⁸

⁸ Harvard's community reputation is far less positive in neighborhoods of Allston and Cambridge where university growth threatens middle class neighborhoods.

With the permission of the subjects, interviews were recorded and transcribed for analysis. As the fieldwork progressed, I wrote a series of memos (Lofland and Lofland 1995) on emerging patterns. These memos then informed revisions to the interview protocols after the pilot interviews. The importance of older peers was not hypothesized in advance but rather emerged from the neighborhood informant interviews and the initial set of pilot interviews in Roxbury Crossing and Franklin. It was not until the revised protocol that explicit probes about age of friends and acquaintances were incorporated into the interviews, which was critical for examining differences across neighborhoods. Similarly, neighborhood violence was not a focal topic in the fieldwork until after the pilot interviews, when it became clear that violence and fear of victimization structured much of the boys' use of space and social networks in Roxbury Crossing and Franklin, and that this was a key difference between neighborhoods in these two areas and those in Lower Mills.

After all interviews were complete, transcripts were coded into categories using Atlas.ti based on codes generated in two ways. One type of code included a priori theoretical perspectives derived from prior research and theory. The second type included codes generated from preliminary findings described in the memos. (A full list of codes and their descriptions, too long to include here, is available from the author). The final set of coded transcripts allowed two complementary modes of analysis. Person-centered analysis was conducted by considering each subject individually to understand the relevance of various theoretical concepts to his perspectives and daily experiences. For example, reading through coded transcripts one-by-one and noticing the connection between the "peers-age" code and the "neighborhood rivalries" code among Franklin and

Roxbury Crossing subjects. Once key themes emerged (or having already emerged from the memos, were confirmed in the systematically coded data), a neighborhood-centered analysis was conducted by comparing interview data in theoretical categories across neighborhoods. Using Atlas, I generated queries based on codes and compared coded quotes systematically across neighborhoods to understand the key differences across neighborhoods. These sets of quotes then became the basis for the initial paper draft, as they indicated which interviews contained the best examples. As this evidence was introduced into the paper, however, I returned to reading the whole transcripts to understand the larger context of the quotes extracted using the Atlas software.

NELS Data and Analysis

The National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS) follows a cohort of 8th graders sampled in 1988. NELS sampled schools and then students within schools. This analysis uses variables from the base year and the first follow-up (in 1990), when most of the students should have been in the 10th grade. NELS made efforts to collect data on students who dropped out of school after the base year data collection, and this analysis includes those adolescents as well.

The variable of primary interest measures whether or not the adolescent spends most of his or her time with older individuals, but only includes older individuals who are 25 or younger to avoid including significantly older adults such as parents and other kin or teachers and social service providers. This range also corresponded to the age of the older peers in the interview data. This binary variable is based on the following question (number 73 in the student questionnaire and number 58 in the drop out questionnaire):

“Think about the people with whom you spend most of your time. What age group are they in? (mark all that apply) (a) 13 or younger, (b) 14-15 years old, (c) 16-17 years old, (d) 18-19 years old, (e) 20-21 years old, (f) 22-25 years old, (g) 26 and older.” I compare each respondent’s age in 1990 with his or her responses to this question to determine if any of the age groups selected are older (with the exception of “26 and over”). While this survey question does not provide an ideal measure of the age structure of an adolescent’s peer group, it is the best available in any large, nationally representative survey of which I am aware. See the main text for limitations.

The NELS restricted data set includes variables from the 1990 census on the characteristics of the zip code of the student residence at base year. The zip code serves as the measure of neighborhood. While zip codes are much larger than the census tracts typically used in neighborhoods research, zip code is the only measure of community context available for the NELS data and has been used in prior research using NELS to study neighborhoods (e.g. Ainsworth 2002, Catsambis and Beveridge 2001). To measure the socioeconomic character of the adolescent’s zip code of residence, I take the mean of six standardized variables: family poverty rate, male unemployment rate, percent of families headed by a single mother, median household income, percent of workers in managerial or professional occupations, and percent of individual over age 25 who have a college degree (with the last three reversed in polarity). The resulting “neighborhood disadvantage” scale has a mean inter-item correlation of 0.60 and a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91. To avoid making linearity assumptions in the analysis, I then divide zip codes into five quintiles based on this variable.

The analysis sample includes respondents with non-missing data on zip code characteristics, the “spends time with older individuals” variable, and the first follow-up questionnaire weight. I only include those cases in urban zip codes (defined as zip codes with at least half the population within a metro area).

Table 1 in the main text displays the proportion of NELS respondents who report spending most of their time with older individuals by neighborhood disadvantaged quintile (the fifth quintile is the most disadvantaged). There are 20 respondents with missing data on gender who appear only in the “All Adolescents” column. These estimates take into account the NELS sampling design and sample weights using Stata’s complex survey data procedures.

It is possible that the neighborhood differences observed in Table 1 are the product of individual, family, or school characteristics rather than neighborhood characteristics, so I also estimated a logistic regression model that controls for possible sources of spuriousness. Descriptive statistics for these control variables are displayed in Table S3. Primary Parent Education is that of the mother or female guardian if available and the father or other male guardian if the mother data is not available.

Many control variables have at least some missing values. Rather than drop cases with missing values, I impute missing values using multiple imputation (see Acock 2005 for a non-technical discussion and references therein for more technical material, particularly Little and Rubin 2002, Allison 2002). Multiple imputation involves creating multiple full datasets via MICE (multiple imputation by chained equations), estimating a model using each full dataset, and then combining results across datasets in a way that takes into account the variance in imputed values across datasets. I use Royston’s (2004)

“ice” command in Stata to generate ten imputed datasets and the “micombine” command to estimate ten models and combine results across models.

Table S4 displays estimates from the logistic regression. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering of students by zip code, and the NELS sampling weight is employed to deal with survey non-response and representativeness. Even after controlling for individual, family, and school characteristics, the association between neighborhood disadvantage and socializing with older individuals remains large and statistically significant. Note that this model includes controls for whether the student has ever been held back in school and the number of older brothers and sisters he or she has. I experimented with gender interaction terms, but none were either substantively or statistically significant, so they are not included in this model.

Additional References

- Acock, Alan C. 2005. "Working With Missing Values." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: 1012-1028.
- Ainsworth, James W. 2002. "Why Does it Take a Village? The Mediation of Neighborhood Effects on Educational Achievement." *Social Forces* 81: 117-152.
- Allison, Paul D. 2002. *Missing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carter, Prudence. 2005. *Keepin' It Real: School Success Beyond Black and White*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Catsambis, Sophia and Andrew A. Beveridge. 2001. "Does Neighborhood Matter? Family, Neighborhood and School Influences on Eighth- Grade Mathematics Achievement." *Sociological Focus* 34: 435-457.
- Eder, Donna and Laura Fingerson. 2003. "Interviewing Children and Adolescents." Pp. 33-54 in James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium, eds. *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Furstenberg, Frank, Jr. and Mary Elizabeth Hughes. 1997. "The Influence of Neighborhoods on Children's Development: A Theoretical Perspective and Research Agenda," p. 23-47 in Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Greg J. Duncan, and J. Lawrence Aber, eds. *Neighborhood Poverty, Vol. 2: Policy Implications in Studying Neighborhoods*. New York: Russell Sage
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Kefalas, Maria. 2003. *Working Class Heroes: Protecting Home, Community, and Nation in a Chicago Neighborhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Little, Roderick J. A. and Donald B. Rubin. 2002. *Statistical Analysis With Missing Data*, 2nd Edition. New York: Wiley.
- Lofland, John and Lyn Lofland 1995. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Royston, Patrick. 2004. "Multiple imputation of missing values." *The Stata Journal* 4: 227-241.
- Small, Mario L. 2004. *Villa Victoria: The Transformation of Social Capital in a Boston Barrio*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Swidler, Ann. 2001. *Talk of Love*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Table S1: Selected Characteristics of Study Fieldwork Areas

	Franklin <i>(Tracts 924 & 1001)</i>	Roxbury Crossing <i>(Tracts 805 & 806)</i>	Lower Mills <i>(Tracts 1004 & 1009)</i>	City of Boston
Demographics				
Black	75%	56%	64%	25%
Hispanic	25%	33%	6%	14%
Female	55%	54%	55%	52%
Children (age 0-17)	38%	33%	27%	20%
Foreign Born	27%	23%	26%	26%
Socio-Economic Status				
Family Poverty	36%	38%	10%	15%
Median HH Income in 1999	\$23,157	\$15,371	\$43,973	\$39,629
Managerial/Professional Occs	30%	44%	55%	70%
Affluent Families (1999 Income > \$75K)	8%	4%	27%	26%
HH with Public Assistance Income, 1999	15%	9%	3%	4%
College Educated (25+)	7%	10%	22%	36%
Less than HS Education (25+)	38%	35%	20%	21%
Female-Headed Families (with children)	65%	69%	41%	40%
Male Joblessness (Age 16-59)	45%	51%	35%	31%
Male Unemployment (Age 16-59)	15%	14%	6%	8%
Residential Stability				
Owner Occupied Housing	22%	6%	51%	32%
Same Residence 5 Years Ago	59%	55%	61%	48%
Density (persons/sq mile)	22,750	17,314	17,253	12,172
Total Population	11,900	6,166	9,567	589,141

Source: 2000 Census

Table S2: Demographic Characteristics of Adolescent Male Research Subjects

<i>Pseudonym</i>	<i>Study Area</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Family Structure</i>
Joseph	Franklin	15	Latino/White	Parents Cohabiting
Simon	Franklin	16	Black	Single Mother
Reed	Franklin	15	Black	Single Mother
Chris	Franklin	14	Black	Single Mother
Manuel	Franklin	15	Latino	Single Mother
Ramiro	Franklin	16	Latino	Mother+Stepfather
Dalton	Franklin	15	Black	Single Mother
Shaquille	Franklin	18	Black	Mother+Stepfather
David	Franklin	17	Black	Single Mother
Rico	Franklin	16	Latino	Mother+Stepfather
Terrell	Franklin	16	Black	Parents Married
Jared	Franklin	18	Black	Single Mother
Andrew	Franklin	15	Latino	Single Mother
Tamarr	Franklin	14	Black	Single Father
Montel	Franklin	15	Black	Single Mother
Denzel	Franklin	15	Black	Single Mother
Junior	Franklin	16	Black	Single Mother
Fernando	Franklin	15	Latino	Father+Stepmother
Sean	Franklin	14	Black	Aunt
Paul	Franklin	14	Black	Single Mother
Zachary	Roxbury Crossing	14	Black	Single Mother
Malcolm	Roxbury Crossing	13	Latino	Grandparents
Miguel	Roxbury Crossing	16	Latino	Parents Married
Edwin	Roxbury Crossing	15	Black	Single Mother
Marcus	Roxbury Crossing	16	Black	Grandmother
James	Roxbury Crossing	14	Black	Single Mother
Duante	Roxbury Crossing	17	Black	Single Mother
Jerome	Roxbury Crossing	13	Black	Single Mother
Jamar	Roxbury Crossing	14	Black	Aunt
Eduardo	Roxbury Crossing	17	Latino	Single Mother
Daniel	Roxbury Crossing	17	Black	Single Mother
Tyree	Roxbury Crossing	17	Black	Single Mother
Ramone	Roxbury Crossing	17	Latino	Grandmother
Aaron	Roxbury Crossing	13	Black	Single Mother
Dillan	Roxbury Crossing	14	Black	Single Mother
Elijah	Roxbury Crossing	14	Black	Parents Married
Deon	Roxbury Crossing	13	Black	Grandmother
Emilio	Roxbury Crossing	13	Black/Latino	Single Mother
Ivan	Roxbury Crossing	15	Latino	Single Mother
Dustin	Roxbury Crossing	15	Black/Latino	Single Mother
Isaac	Lower Mills	13	Black	Foster Mother
Jordan	Lower Mills	13	Black	Mother+Grandmother

William	Lower Mills	16	Black	Single Mother
Seth	Lower Mills	14	Black	Single Mother
Darnell	Lower Mills	14	Black	Single Mother
Kevin	Lower Mills	13	Black	Mother+Aunt
Jason	Lower Mills	18	Black	Parents Married
Delbert	Lower Mills	14	Black	Single Mother
Charles	Lower Mills	15	Black	Single Mother
Cyril	Lower Mills	16	Black	Father+Stepmother
Marshall	Lower Mills	17	Black	Parents Married
Esteban	Lower Mills	17	Black/Latino	Parents Married
Nathan	Lower Mills	17	Black	Single Mother
Tavon	Lower Mills	18	Black	Single Mother
Dante	Lower Mills	16	Black	Parents Married
Elton	Lower Mills	17	Black	Parents Married
Bradley	Lower Mills	13	Black	Grandmother
Reynard	Lower Mills	13	Black	Single Mother
Coleman	Lower Mills	17	Black	Single Mother
Timothy	Lower Mills	14	Black	Parents Married

Table S3: NELS Sample Descriptive Statistics (Unweighted); N= 9,302

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>% Imputed</i>
Spends Time with Older People	0.534	--	0	1	0%
N'hood Disadvantage Scale					
1 st Quintile	0.162	--	0	1	0%
2 nd Quintile	0.195	--	0	1	0%
3 rd Quintile	0.207	--	0	1	0%
4 th Quintile	0.253	--	0	1	0%
5 th Quintile	0.184	--	0	1	0%
Female	0.513	--	0	1	0.22%
Non-Hispanic White	0.634	--	0	1	0.69%
Non-Hispanic Black	0.106	--	0	1	0.69%
Hispanic	0.146	--	0	1	0.69%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.088	--	0	1	0.69%
American Indian	0.026	--	0	1	0.69%
Age	13.740	0.653	12	17	0.00%
Foreign Born	0.086	--	0	1	8.26%
Mother Foreign Born	0.193	--	0	1	8.70%
Father Foreign Born	0.186	--	0	1	9.75%
Primary Parent Education					
Less Than HS	0.091	--	0	1	0.86%
High School/GED	0.150	--	0	1	0.86%
Some College/Associates Degree	0.373	--	0	1	0.86%
College Degree	0.185	--	0	1	0.86%
Master's Degree	0.118	--	0	1	0.86%
Professional Degree	0.083	--	0	1	0.86%
Family Income (thousands)	\$42.1	\$47.8	\$0	\$300	10.72%
Mother Works	0.896	--	0	1	1.26%
Father Works	0.935	--	0	1	5.53%
Family Type					
Mother-Father	0.692	--	0	1	0.45%
Mother-Male Guardian	0.093	--	0	1	0.45%
Father-Female Guardian	0.019	--	0	1	0.45%
Single Mother	0.151	--	0	1	0.45%
Single Father	0.023	--	0	1	0.45%
Other	0.021	--	0	1	0.45%
Ever Held Back in School	0.141	--	0	1	5.84%
Number of Older Brothers	0.789	1.099	0	7	5.85%
Number Older Sisters	0.748	1.095	0	7	7.51%
School % Free Lunch	19.841	23.903	0	100	1.68%
School % Minority	28.408	30.329	0	100	2.17%
Public School	0.753	--	0	1	0%
Catholic School	0.116	--	0	1	0%
Non-Catholic Religious School	0.050	--	0	1	0%
Private Non-Religious School	0.081	--	0	1	0%

Table S4: Logit Model Predicting Whether Respondent Reports Spending Most of His or Her Time With People Who Are Older (but under age 26)

	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>
Zip Code Disadvantage Scale			
2 nd Quintile	0.191	0.114	1.21
3 rd Quintile	0.265	0.130	1.30
4 th Quintile	0.281*	0.144	1.32
5 th Quintile	0.379*	0.148	1.46
Female	0.516*	0.070	1.68
Non-Hispanic Black	0.095	0.155	1.10
Hispanic	0.087	0.149	1.09
Asian/Pacific Islander	-0.093	0.218	0.91
American Indian	0.296	0.197	1.34
Age 12	6.316*	1.021	553.18
Age 13	2.679*	0.090	14.57
Age 15	0.494*	0.159	1.64
Age 16	0.378	0.344	1.46
Age 17	-0.810	0.897	0.44
Foreign Born	-0.003	0.204	1.00
Mother Foreign Born	-0.073	0.208	0.93
Father Foreign Born	-0.037	0.178	0.96
Primary Parent Education			
Less Than HS	0.176	0.144	1.19
Some College/Associates Degree	0.016	0.111	1.02
College Degree	-0.225	0.133	0.80
Master's Degree	-0.393*	0.159	0.67
Professional Degree	-0.398	0.221	0.67
Family Income (thousands)	0.0003	0.001	1.00
Mother Works	-0.243	0.127	0.78
Father Works	-0.492*	0.147	0.61
Family Type			
Mother-Male Guardian	0.365*	0.136	1.44
Father-Female Guardian	0.390	0.400	1.48
Single Mother	0.415	0.293	1.51
Single Father	0.075	0.108	1.08
Other	0.295	0.236	1.34
Ever Held Back in School	0.205	0.145	1.23
Number of Older Brothers	0.058	0.042	1.06
Number Older Sisters	0.044	0.043	1.05
School % Free Lunch	0.000	0.003	1.00
School % Minority	0.001	0.002	1.00
Catholic School	-0.300*	0.121	0.74
Non-Catholic Religious School	-0.729*	0.214	0.48
Private Non-Religious School	0.265	0.370	1.30
Constant	-0.545*	0.235	0.58

N = 9,302; * p < 0.05

SE's adjusted for clustering by neighborhood (zip code)

Weighted using NELS First Follow-Up Questionnaire Weight

Missing values on control variables imputed using multiple imputation with 10 replications